

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 stand rejected by this Office Action. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-21 for the reasons as will be discussed.

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 10, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Substance of Interview on October 1 and October 8, 2008

Applicant and Examiner Coughlan discussed the 112 rejection of claims 7 and 16 and the 103 rejection of claim 1. Examiner Coughlan indicated that he will withdraw the 112 rejection based on the written description in the specification. Applicant and Examiner Coughlan also discussed possible amendments to claim 1 regarding the 103 rejection. However, no agreement was reached.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Office Action alleges that (Page 7. Emphasis added.):

Claims 7, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. These claims use the term 'capturing portions' which is not clear in response to the specification. Is this outputting the results in response to a user's input? The Examiner does not want to make assumptions on what is meant by 'capturing portions' but feels this is easily remedied by amending the claims to fit language used within the specification.

Applicant believes that claims 7 and 16 comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. For example, the specification discloses that the student can move forward and back through that stack of transactions (as presented in the tutorial presentation). (Page 15, line 11 – page 16, line 12.) Consequently, portions of the tutorial presentation are captured so that the student can move

back and forward in the presentation. During the telephonic interview on October 1, 2008, Examiner Coughlan appeared to concur with Applicant's arguments. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 7 and 16.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,535,422 (Chiang).

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of “monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands at a particular instance of time, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain, at least one of the plurality of characteristics being time-dependent.”¹ The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed, e.g., page 9, line 32 – page 10, line 6.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action alleges (Page 18. Emphasis added.)

The applicant states that 'Chiang fails to even suggest the feature of monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a

¹ The specification recites “A profile is composed of two types of structures: characteristics and collective characteristics. A characteristic is a conditional (the if half of a rule) that identifies a subset of the domain that is important for determining what feedback to deliver to the student. Example characteristics include: Wrong debit account in transaction 1; Perfect cost classification; At Least 1 DUI in the last 3 years; More than \$4000 in claims in the last 2 years; and More than two at-fault accidents in 5 years A characteristic's conditional uses one or more atomics as the operands to identify the subset of the domain that defines the characteristic. An atomic only makes reference to a single property of a single entity in the domain; thus the term atomic. Example atomics include: The number of DUI's >= 1 ; ROI > 10%; and Income between \$75,000 and \$1 10,000. **A collective characteristic is a conditional that uses multiple characteristics and/or other collective characteristics as its operands. Collective characteristics allow instructional designers to build richer expressions (i.e., ask more complex questions). Example collective characteristics include: Bad Household driving record; Good Credit Rating; Marginal Credit Rating; Problems with Cash for Expense transactions; and Problems with Sources and uses of cash.** Once created, designers are able to reuse these elements within multiple expressions, which significantly eases the burden of creating additional profiles. When building a profile from its elements, atomics can be used by multiple characteristics, characteristics can be used by multiple collective characteristics and profiles, and collective characteristics can be used by multiple collective characteristics and profiles. Figure 5 illustrates an insurance underwriting profile in accordance with a preferred embodiment.” (Page 9, line 32-page 10, line 6. Emphasis added.)

conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.' The Examiner disagrees. 'Monitoring' of applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang. (Chiang, C3:9-19) 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. The 'tutorial system' is composed of tutorial information. **The tutorial information is presented by a series of lesson panels. Each lesson panel can be seen as a characteristic. Then the series of lesson panels can be seen as the 'collective characteristic' of applicant.** (Chiang, C5:8-35, C7: 17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:21-45)

As alleged by the Office Action, Chiang discusses tutorial information that is presented in a series of lesson panels, where a lesson panel is equivalent to a characteristic. Chiang requires that a user sequence through a series of lesson panels. Each lesson panel (characteristic) is separated in time as a user sequences through the lesson panels. For example, action bar selections (as shown in fig. 6 of Chiang) typically change as the user progresses from one lesson panel to another. Consequently, the teachings of Chiang fail to consider a plurality of characteristics at a particular instance of time when at least one of the characteristics is time-dependent (i.e., change with time).

Independent claim 10 includes the similar feature of “logic that monitors progress toward the goal, determines at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and provides feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands at a particular instance of time, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain, at least one of the plurality of characteristics being time-dependent.” Also, independent claim 19 includes the feature of “monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile from that is true for the current simulation task a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands at a particular instance of time, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain, at least one of the plurality of characteristics being time-dependent.” Moreover, claims 2-3, 5, 7, 11-12, 14, 16, and 20-21 ultimately depend from claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chiang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,372,507 (Goleh).

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 10. Moreover, the deficiencies of Chiang are not remedied by Goleh, and thus claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18.

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 13, 2008

/Kenneth F. Smolik/
Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001